

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
OCALA DIVISION**

CONNIE M RIVERA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 5:19-cv-395-Oc-PRL

**COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY,**

Defendant.

ORDER


This Social Security appeal is before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff's motion requesting the Court to reconsider its Order affirming the decision of the Administrative Law Judge. (Docs. 36 & 37).

Plaintiff's motion is essentially a reiteration of the arguments previously submitted to the Court. Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its findings and contends that she is disabled and restates her argument that her records establish disabling conditions. Plaintiff also states a litany of alleged errors committed by the Court. She provides a supplement with an "advocate/witness" statement that she contends supports her argument that she is disabled. Upon careful review, however, none of the alleged errors would have any bearing on the Court's decision in this matter. For example, Plaintiff alleges a number of errors, many of which are somewhat incomprehensible or irrelevant, including that she sued William Barr, and not the Acting Commissioner of Social Security, and that the Court "didn't do by Florida law process order." (Doc. 36, p. 3).

Plaintiff also contends that this case was reassigned due to a clerical error, and that she previously had a “civil judge.” Plaintiff appears to question to undersigned’s authority to preside over this matter. A review of the docket confirms that this matter was referred to me pursuant to proper court procedures and in accordance with the Notice, Consent and Reference of a Civil Action to a Magistrate Judge (Doc. 19) that was signed by both parties, and the resulting Reference Order entered by the District Judge (Doc. 22). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 73.

As set forth in the Court’s prior Order (Doc. 34), based upon a review of the record, the Court found that substantial evidence supports the ALJ’s findings, the RFC determination, and the conclusion that the Plaintiff was not disabled. *See Miles v. Chater*, 84 F.3d 1397, 1400 (11th Cir. 1996) (“If the Commissioner's decision is supported by substantial evidence we must affirm, even if the proof preponderates against it.”). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate otherwise. Her motion for reconsideration (Doc. 36) is due to be Denied.

DONE and ORDERED in Ocala, Florida on February 1, 2021.



PHILIP R. LAMMENS
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record
Unrepresented Parties